

Appl. No. 10/604,746  
Amdt. dated July 13, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 27, 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Figure 3 has been amended to replace the reference character “112” of the video system with the reference character “113”. Paragraphs [0018], [0020], and [0025] of the specification have also been amended to reflect this change. Acceptance of the  
5 drawings is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

1 page

10

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Objection to the specification:

5       The disclosure is objected to because reference number "112" has been used to refer to both the video system and the input buttons. Appropriate correction is required.

**Response:**

10       As mentioned above with respect to the amendments to the drawings, paragraphs [0018], [0020], and [0025] of the specification have been amended to replace the reference character "112" of the video system with the reference character "113". Acceptance of the specification is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

15       Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

20       Claim 4 recites " $F=T/N$ ", however frequency is a measure of occurrences over time, with the unit of time in the denominator of the equation, not in the numerator.

**Response:**

25       Claim 4 has been corrected to now recite the equation " $F=N/T$ ". Paragraphs [0020] and [0028] have also been amended to reflect this change.  
Reconsideration of claim 4 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

30       Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860).

**Response:**

5           Claim 1 has been amended to overcome these rejections. Claim 1 now contains the limitations previously recited in claim 10. In addition, the claim now recites that “the character set file containing a list of **only** those characters included in all text files stored in the memory of the audio player”. Support for this amendment is found in the end of paragraph [0019], and no new matter is added.

10           Lai does not teach this feature. Griffin et al. (US 2004/0080487) teaches in paragraphs [0007] and [0047] that an electronic device used for typing text messages includes a symbol set, and may include Roman symbols, Chinese, symbols, and Japanese symbols. However, Griffin does not teach that the character set file contains a list of **only** those characters included in all text files  
15           stored in the memory of the audio player, as is claimed. As a result, Griffin’s character set is not the smallest size possible.

20           Therefore the applicant submits that claim 1 is now patentable over the cited prior art references. Claims 2, 9, and 11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

25           Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Michelson et al. (US 2002/0072047).

**Response:**

30           Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 3 is therefore respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claims 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Holtz et al. (US 2002/0186233).

5 **Response:**

Claims 4-8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 4-8 is therefore respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10 Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Griffin et al. (US 2004/0080487).

**Response:**

Claim 10 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

15

7. Introduction to new claims 23-26:

New claim 23 is drafted to include the limitations of claims 1 and 4. In addition, claim 23 also recites that in the equation  $F=N/T$  for calculating a rate at which text is displayed on the display device, F represents a moving frequency at which text is displayed on the display device, N represents a **total quantity** of text stored in the first text file, and T represents the **total time duration** of the first audio file. Support for this limitation is found in paragraph [0020] of the specification, and no new matter is added.

25 Holtz teaches calculating a scroll rate in terms of words per minute for scrolling text across a display. The scroll rate can be increased or decreased, and other buttons can be pressed for viewing a previous screen or a next screen of text. However, Holtz does not teach dividing a total quantity of text in a text file corresponding to a first audio file by the total time duration of the first audio file.  
30 Instead, Holtz only teaches that a scroll rate is measured in terms of words per

unit of time. Therefore, Holtz does not teach the same way of calculating the scroll rate the claimed invention uses. For these reasons, claim 23 is patentable over the cited prior art.

5           Claims 24 and 25 are substantial duplicates of the original claims 5 and 6, and are dependent on new claim 23.

10           New claim 26 is drafted to include the limitations of claims 1, 4, 5, and 6. Differing from the original claim 6, claim 26 now recites that the quantity of text N is selected from a group consisting of  $N_C$ ,  $N_S$ , and  $N_P$ , wherein  $N_C$  represents a number of characters in the first text file,  $N_S$  represents a number of sentences in the first text file, and  $N_P$  represents a number of paragraphs in the first text file. Claim 26 does not include choice of selecting  $N_W$  for the quantity of text N, where  $N_W$  represents a number of words in the first text file.

15           In contrast, Holtz only teaches that the scroll rate is measured in terms of words per unit of time, and does not teach that the quantity of text can be selected from the group consisting of  $N_C$ ,  $N_S$ , and  $N_P$ , representing characters, sentences, or paragraphs in the text file. Therefore, claim 26 is patentable over the cited  
20           prior art.

          Consideration of new claims 23-26 is respectfully requested.

25           In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

30

Appl. No. 10/604,746  
Amdt. dated July 13, 2007  
Reply to Office action of April 27, 2007

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 07/13/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)